



May 15, 2002

Mr. Brad Norton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin - Law Department
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2002-2578

Dear Mr. Norton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 162918.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for copies of eight categories of information pertaining to sexual harassment investigations, a specified former city employee, and a specified current city employee. You state that you will release the information that is responsive to request items five, six, and seven. You claim, however, that the information that is responsive to request items one, two, three, four, and eight, is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information consists of four sexual harassment investigations. Two of these investigations are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides that:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[;]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Two of the sexual harassment investigations constitute completed investigations that must be released under section 552.022(a)(1), unless they are confidential under other law or are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Although you claim that these two investigations are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that this exception is a discretionary exception to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the ("Act")) that does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.¹ Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of these two investigations from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, you also claim that portions of these two investigations are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.² Information is protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. See *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. See *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. See *id.* The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. See *id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Therefore, when there is an adequate summary of an investigation, the summary must be released, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements.

¹ Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general).

² Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by the common-law right to privacy.

Although information relating to an investigation of a sexual harassment claim involving a public employee may be highly intimate or embarrassing, the public generally has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of such an investigation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performances or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow); *see also Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525.

Based on our review of your arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that the information related to the first of these two investigations comprises an adequate summary of the sexual harassment investigation. *See id.* at 525-26. We also conclude that a portion of the information related to the second investigation, which we have marked, comprises an adequate summary of that sexual harassment investigation. *See id.* With regard to this second investigation, we, thus, conclude that the city must withhold from disclosure the remaining information related to that investigation pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. We note that portions of each of the two summaries constitute identifying information of the alleged victims and witnesses to the sexual harassment. Accordingly, we conclude that the city must withhold from disclosure the identifying information of the alleged victims and witnesses to the sexual harassment that we have marked in the summaries pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. However, the remaining portions of the two summaries must be released to the requestor.

We now address the remaining two sexual harassment investigations. You claim that these investigations are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code, § 552.103(a),(c). The city maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular

situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body receives the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *see also Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

A governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture" when establishing that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.³ *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). You state, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor has filed a complaint with the Texas Commission on Human Rights (the "TCHR") alleging discrimination and retaliation. The TCHR operates as a federal deferral agency under section 706(c) of title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") defers jurisdiction to the TCHR over complaints alleging employment discrimination. *See id.* Based on our review of your arguments and the remaining investigations, we conclude that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this matter and that the remaining two investigations are related to the reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining two investigations from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and may not be withheld from disclosure on that basis. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

³In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

In summary, the city must withhold from disclosure the identifying information of the alleged victims and witnesses to the sexual harassment that we have marked in the two summaries pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. The city must release the remaining portions of each of these summaries to the requestor. The city must withhold the remaining information related to one of these two investigations from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. The city may withhold the remaining two investigations from disclosure in their entirety pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).


If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/seg

Ref: ID# 162918

Enc. Marked documents

cc: Ms. Susan Murray
9801 Stonelake Boulevard #1224
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)